



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,558	02/20/2004	Robert F. Day	MSFT122011	7539
26389 7590 10/21/2008 CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347				
EXAMINER TOLENTINO, RODERICK				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2434				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/21/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/783,558

Applicant(s)

DAY ET AL.

Examiner

Roderick Tolentino

Art Unit

2434

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08/14/2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 29 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/14/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 12 and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 – 8, 10 – 12, 14 – 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siegel et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2002/0143961) in view

of Challener et al. U.S. Patent No. (6,470,454) and Hamzy et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2004/0210928).

6. As per claims 1, 12 and 19, Siegel teaches storing a user choice setting as a protected value that is secured by an access control indicator (Siegel, Paragraph 0004 0039, user permissions stored in a database with modification settings, use of passwords protect an account) receiving an input from a user authorizing an application to modify the user choice setting on the user's behalf (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, user needs to be authenticated prior to the modification of a profile), modifying the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value, modifying the user choice setting by writing a modified user choice setting to the protected value (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, once a party whether the user or administrator is verified or authenticated, changes to the settings maybe made thus taking a way any protection indicators), and restoring the access control indicator to prevent writing to the protected value (Siegel, 0026, inherent that once a user or administrator is done modifying the profile the user or administrator will log out and the profile will be protected from modifications until another party is verified and authenticated), but fails to teach the user choice setting determining an application's operation in a user's computing device, the application's operation including handling a particular event in the user's computing device, in response to receiving a request from the application to modify the user choice setting, requesting authorization from the user to modify the user choice setting. However, in an analogous art Challener teaches the user choice setting determining an application's operation in a user's computing device, the application's operation

including handling a particular event in the user's computing device (Challener, Col. 1 Lines 52 – 57, Modify user settings in a system configuration), and Hamzy teaches in response to receiving a request from the application to modify the user choice setting, requesting authorization from the user to modify the user choice setting (Hamzy, Claims 5 and 12, user requests a choice setting, authentication is done to confirm user, one of ordinary skill in the art would know that that program/application will make the setting changes on the behalf of the user).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Challener's Method and apparatus for establishing computer configuration protection passwords for protecting computer configurations with Siegel's access control protocol for user profile management because it offers the advantage of preventing changes to a system without authorization (Challener, Col. 2 Lines 45 - 48).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Hamzy's system for selectively de-scrambling media signals with Siegel's access control protocol for user profile management because it offers the advantage of monitoring appropriate or inappropriate data (Hamzy, Paragraph 0025).

7. As per claims 2 and 20, Siegel teaches wherein the user's computing device has an operating system with a registry and the protected value is a registry key stored in the registry (Siegel, Paragraphs 0019 and 0020, user preferences stored in a database) and the access control indicator is an access control list (ACL) that has been initialized

Art Unit: 2434

to prevent writing to the protected value (Siegel, Paragraph 0004 and 0039, user permissions stored in a database with modification settings, use of passwords protect an account).

8. As per claims 3, 16 and 21 Siegel teaches herein the user's computing device has an operating system with a registry and modifying the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value includes providing to the user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system (Siegel, Paragraphs 0020 and 0026, once a party whether the user or administrator is verified or authenticated, changes to the settings maybe made thus taking a way any protection indicators).

9. As per claims 4, 17 and 22, Siegel teaches modifying the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value includes providing to the user ownership of the registry key that the ACL secures, wherein ownership of the registry key automatically provides to the user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, once a party whether the user or administrator is verified or authenticated, changes to the settings maybe made thus taking a way any protection indicators).

10. As per claims 5, 18 and 23 Siegel teaches modifying the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value includes allowing the user to temporarily take ownership of the registry key that the ACL secures after receiving the input from the user authorizing the application to modify the user choice setting on the user's behalf (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, once a party whether the user or administrator is verified or

authenticated, changes to the settings maybe made thus taking a way any protection indicators).

11. As per claim 6, Siegel teaches restoring the access control indicator to prevent writing to the protected value includes removing user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system (Siegel, 0026, inherent that once a user or administrator is done modifying the profile the user or administrator will log out and the profile will be protected from modifications until another party is verified and authenticated).

12. As per claims 7 and 25, Siegel teaches removing user rights to modify the ACL includes returning ownership of the registry key that the ACL secures to the operating system (Siegel, 0026, inherent that once a user or administrator is done modifying the profile the user or administrator will log out and the profile will be protected from modifications until another party is verified and authenticated).

13. As per claims 8 and 26, Siegel teaches generating a user choice setting user interface (UI), displaying the current user choice setting on the UI along with other options for the user choice setting (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, interface for user to modify settings) and receiving the authorizing input from the UI, along with a further input indicating a modified user choice setting including at least one of the other displayed options for the user choice setting Siegel, Paragraph 0026, once a party whether the user or administrator is verified or authenticated, changes to the settings maybe made thus taking a way any protection indicators).

14. As per claims 10, 14 and 28 Siegel teaches the user choice settings of a task association, this choice being one of the options listed by the applicant's claim language (Siegel, Paragraph 0004, user can change permissions regarding the task of what clients have access to).

15. As per claims 11, 15 and 29, Siegel teaches the registered client setting includes at least one of a Web browser, this choice being one of the options listed by the applicant's claim language (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, web browser).

16. As per claim 24, Siegel teaches the instruction to lock the ACL to prevent writing to the protected value includes an instruction to remove user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system (Siegel, 0026, inherent that once a user or administrator is done modifying the profile the user or administrator will log out and the profile will be protected from modifications until another party is verified and authenticated).

17. Claims 9, 13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siegel et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2002/0143961) and Challener et al. U.S. Patent No. (6,470,454) and amzy et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2004/0210928) in view of Giordano, III et al. U.S. Patent No. (6,370,141).

18. As per claims 9, 13 and 27 Siegel fails to teach generating a change notification to the user whenever the user choice setting has been modified, the change notification identifying the application that modified the user setting and the contents of the protected value before and after the modification. However, in an analogous art

Art Unit: 2434

Giordano teaches generating a change notification to the user whenever the user choice setting has been modified, the change notification identifying the application that modified the user setting and the contents of the protected value before and after the modification (Giordano, Col. 4, Lines 15 – 24, user notification of changes).

At the time the invention was made, it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Giordano's apparatus for configuring internet appliance with Siegel's access control protocol for user profile management because it offers the advantage of letting a user know of changed made to a system (Giordano, Col. 4, Lines 15 – 24, user notification of changes).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roderick Tolentino whose telephone number is (571) 272-2661. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2434

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Roderick Tolentino
Examiner
Art Unit 2434

Roderick Tolentino
/R. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2434
/Kambiz Zand/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2434